

## CHAPTER FOUR: WESTERN VIEWS VS INDIGENOUS VIEWS OF DEVELOPMENT

---

### (4.1) WESTERN VIEWS OF DEVELOPMENT

Whilst Chapter Three examined iwi definitions this chapter looks at Western views of development and modernisation. What is argued here is the fact that development is a term that has taken on a range of meanings that are problematic for indigenous groups.

Developmentalism is a term, coined by Jan Nederveen Pieterse (1991), that groups together major Western theories that assume a theory of linear progress. Western hegemony has been driven and maintained by these ideological formations. Imperialism and colonialism, neither of which are dead, have been shaped by the discourses of developmentalism. Which peoples have been viewed as in need of developing? Its the 'natives', 'barbarians', 'savages' and the 'Third World', in fact any non-Western group. Developmentalism has been manifested in different forms such as evolutionism, modernisation and development. As Pieterse outlines:

*The central thesis of developmentalism is that social change occurs to a pre-established pattern, the logic and direction of which are known. Privileged knowledge of the direction of change is claimed by those who declare themselves furthest along its course. Developmentalism is the truth from the point of view of the centre of power: it is the theorization of its own path of development and the comparative method elaborates this.*

(Pieterse 1991:6)

Pieterse notes in the above quote that there are several fundamental aspects to developmentalism. Change is viewed from the 'centre', change is to take place in a pre-ordained pattern as dictated from the centre, the view from the centre is a path of lineal

growth and comparative methods are used to assess whether or not 'development' has been achieved. What this says is that power and control is determined from the centre in a number of ways.

#### (4.1.1) Development Theory

Development began to be studied as a distinct field of study after World War II when a growing number of nations were throwing off the bonds of colonisation. It was assumed that their new found political independence would lead to economic, i.e capitalist, development. The idea of a Third World developed here as the world was divided up into the 'developed' countries i.e the rich and the 'underdeveloped'. However the idea of development emerged out of much earlier evolutionary theories (Worsley 1984).

The idea of development is as old as the expansion of Europe and within all its different forms there has been a notion of duty. Lucy Mair in *Anthropology and Development*, says the earliest phase of Western ideology was first viewed as a duty to God:

*In the earliest phase the duty is to God. It can be seen as an element in the conception of the calling, the task given to man to make more productive the world in which he has been set as Gods steward. This is the message of the Parable of the Talents, of the steward who was condemned because he did not increase the value of the money entrusted to him. It followed that in lands which the inhabitants were failing to exploit to the full, in the original neutral meaning of that verb, others must do it for them.*

(Mair 1984:1)

These types of ideologies legitimated expansion and exploitation. It was God who gave the mandate to use land that was not being worked. The Boers in South Africa are a clear example. But this quote also shows how the missionary agendas coincided with those of colonial settlers and administrators.

John Locke a British philosopher of the 17th Century interpreted the book of Genesis:

*God when he gave the world in common to all mankind, commanded man also to labour... He, that in obedience to this command of God, subdued, tilled and sowed any part of it, thereby annexed to it something that was his property, which another had not title to nor could without injury take it from him.*

(cited in Miller 1985:17)

In other words, Locke felt that 'ownership' of land or property rights should only be vested in those that 'subdued, tilled and sowed' it. God said so, and if the land was not cultivated then it would be deemed common land and could be taken by the Crown to be apportioned later.

The later development of evolutionary ideas also provided useful rationales for colonisation. Evolutionary and other theories of 'race' also contained notions of 'development'.

Early missionaries viewed Maori as being in a state of ignorance and cut off from the knowledge of Christ. Missionaries and other early colonisers believed in the Great Chain Of Being - an ancient philosophy devised by the Greeks and later rehashed by John Locke. This theory envisaged a lineal chain - along which forms of life could be ordered. At the

top of the chain was God with the British close to God and native races closer to apes.

*The concept of natural selection became synonymous with the scientific framework of 'Social Darwinism' which was premised on the belief of the survival of the fittest. It is from this basis that Darwin developed the concept of the social classification of 'Race'.*

(Pihama 1993:20)

The ideological formations that propelled colonisation also included such ideas as the view that there was an enormous technological gap between the colonisers, who came from the 'new' world, and the colonised, who were from the 'old' world. The status of Maori people was relegated to primitive, savage or barbarian because of the view that certain ideologies and material goods were not in Maori culture. The knowledges that were there, were deemed invalid.

Being civilised also meant that nature was to be dominated and that the wilderness was to be tamed. This country was viewed as a land of untapped resources. These views persist today with the often quoted view that there are areas of Maori land that are 'waste' land. Both Europe and later America were to measure human worth in terms of scientific and technological standards.

It was out of these notions of progress and evolutionary ideals that the notions of superiority and domination arose - colonialism was the physical expression of these ideologies. Social evolution was seen as being the same the world over. European christianity envisaged a 'Great Chain Of Being' from God down through the human world, animals, plants and earth.

Maori people were viewed as noble savages on the Chain, down the ladder from the civilised peoples and up the ladder from barbarians.

Colonisation was not just the supplanting of an imperial vision, it also involved the extinguishing of local peoples histories:

*Evolution sorted history, producing an imperial panorama which dehistoricized non-Western peoples or rather which granted them a history only from the perspective of the imperial lighthouse.*

(Pieterse 1991:7)

Development involved more than economic change, it also envisaged structural and organisational change, such as the introduction of particular institutions.

One such institution, here in Aotearoa, was British law. David Williams has analysed British imperialism and the law. He notes that at the height of British imperialism last century, the British saw their own civilisation as 'pivotal to the progress of humanity and superior to all others'. He points to William Blackstone, one of the leading British jurists of the time:

*If an uninhabited country be discovered and planted by English subjects, all the English laws are immediately there in force. For as the law is the birthright of every subject, so wherever they go they carry their laws with them.*

(Blackstone cited in Yensen, Hague, McCreanor 1989:47)

English law was therefore seen as the right of all the citizens of the world, and it was the duty of the 'English subject' to bestow the law wherever they may travel in the world.

*Moreover, the notion of an `uninhabited country' acquired the gloss that `primitive' peoples without regular laws' did not count as `inhabitants' ... so that English laws were immediately assumed to be in force on the acquisition of most colonies.*

(Williams in Yensen et al. 1989:47)

The response to indigenous people's law was to firstly condemn them as savage customs and therefore to be supplanted by English law or they were dealt with under customary law:

*...under the authoritarian control of British District officers or resident magistrates who exercised full political and judicial control over subject populations.*

(Williams Ibid:47)

Development discourse came in to vogue in the 1960s and was viewed as economic development. It was assumed that the governments of newly independent nation states would need help to modernise their economies and their social structures. The United Nations announced the 1960s as the Development Decade. International organisations such as the United Nations, the World Bank, the European Economic Commission, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, who viewed development as economic, were therefore concerned with measuring development.

*In general discourse the keyword became `development' which was generally short for economic development. Thus from a broad sociological and ethnocentric concept of modernization the discourse shifted to a narrow, economic and ethnocentric concept.*

(Pieterse 1991:7)

The antithesis of development was underdevelopment and this was the label applied to those countries that did not measure up. Underdevelopment came from the pre-colonial past and meant that peoples were viewed as being backward. Evolutionary ideas are again visible here as the hierarchy of highly developed, developed and less developed are formed. By implementing the prescribed social planning, backwardness and dependency could be eradicated:

*Underdeveloped countries could and should be as like developed countries as possible, in every way, economically, politically and culturally. They should aim to be free enterprise, (preferably two-party) democracies peopled by responsible citizens with high 'achievement motivation'. And they could be speeded along this path by Western aid, both economic and cultural.*

(Dale 1984:184)

This has meant that there are implicit and explicit evaluative criteria that are used to determine whether development has occurred or not. These evaluative criteria are also bound to moral judgements. The field of development is now dominated by economists who are articulating the general theories of development, formulating policy and responsible for implementation of development strategies (Hall and Midgeley 1988:2).

#### **(4.1.2) Modernisation Theory**

In examining what modernity is, Piortese tracks out how the meanings of modernity have changed. In the 16th Century, modernity indicated the eras of the ancients, the Middle Ages and then the moderns. By the 19th Century it meant contemporaneity and by the 20th Century it was being linked with efficiency and advancement.

During the 1950s and 1960s, modernisation theory dominated Western theory. Modernisation theory has tended to be an American view where modernisation meant becoming more like the U.S. The American way of life is what is considered modern.

Michael Adas (1989), in his article *Machines As The Measure Of Men: Science Technology and Ideologies of Western Dominance* examines the emergence of the U.S. as a world hegemonic power. Following World War One, European leaders were struggling to 'shore up empires under siege and find ways to rebuild their shattered societies'. The U.S began to ascend as the new world power, Adas says, because they had newly won political and economic influence. Whilst Europe was going through some doubts about their civilising mission, the Americans were developing the growing conviction that they knew how best to reform 'backward' societies. As he points out the term modernisation was not used until after World War Two, but American educators, missionaries and engineers were working in China, the Philippines and Latin America before the 1920s.

*Americas path to political stability and prosperity through the rational management of its resources, through the application of science and technology to mass production, and through efforts to adapt the principles of scientific investigation to the study of human behaviour was increasingly held up as the route that 'underdeveloped' and unstable societies were destined to travel as they 'entered the modern age'*

(Adas 1989:403)

This ideology of modernisation was building up to be fully articulated in the 1950s. Other theorists argue that modernisation was a post World War II phenomenon but Adas points clearly to earlier expressions of modernisation theory.



Adas finds that American social scientists continued the thinking of Europe's colonial civilisers who viewed male attitudes, economic activities and political participation as being the spheres of knowledge that counted. Modernisation would mean the developing of societies to come to the realisation that these spheres would be the important ones.

Modernisation was concerned with improvement and efficiency. Tradition is considered a problem that needs to be changed:

*Obviously what was needed had to be diffused from the `centre' (particularly the U.S.A) to the `periphery'. For materialists, it was technology that was needed or capital: the only kind of ideas that were relevant were scientific knowledge and technical know how. for idealists, it was modern values and modernizing attitudes.*

(Worsley 1984:18)

The vision prescribed by modernisation required the adopting of Western political institutions along with economic models.

Both development and modernisation schools saw culture as an obstacle. Because they implicitly held notions of what a developed country would look like, any variation from the Western models were regarded as holding up the process of moving towards the perceived good.

#### **(4.1.3) Dependency Theories**

Dependence is a notion that operates at the personal, interpersonal, nation state level and world level. The ideologies of dependence have been part of the discursive terrain in

which the struggles between indigenous groups and the coloniser have taken place. One of the areas that have helped to shape this discourse have been Dependency theory, a theory of international relations, which was not unlike the psychoanalytic theory of dependency.

Economist Andre Gunder Frank is a leading proponent of this theory. Within this view third world countries are seen to have become impoverished as a direct result of the industrialised countries. Frank says that 'development/underdevelopment are two sides of the same coin'(Frank 1969:4).

Rich countries have gotten rich at the expense of the Third World. The dependency school developed the notion of an inter-relationship between the developed and underdeveloped countries. It was seen that through exploitation, the developed world had created the underdeveloped world.

From here rose the idea of World system theory, leading proponents are Immanuel Wallerstein and Samir Amin. World system theory explains world patterns of power relations and inequalities through a capitalist world economy. The world is divided into core, periphery and semi-periphery according to their relationship to capitalism. The world is viewed as a single system into which all nations fit. This was unlike the earlier theories that saw the world economy as a collection of units or nation states.

Dependency theory assumes that there is only one capitalism. The writings of Jane Haggis however argue that colonial capitalism is different and cannot be read by a Western blueprint. There in fact appear to be a number of capitalisms. She cites the example of India where agriculture does not follow the:

*market oriented, efficient farmer-managers, reinvesting their capital in more efficient technology, better seed, more machines....No conscious rural proletariat was identified. Instead absentee landlords, share-croppers, subsistence small-holders' were what was apparent.*

(Haggis 1988:50)

Here in Aotearoa economic dependency by Maori has been written about extensively. Frequently this writing has been 'victim blaming' in orientation and couched in terms of welfare dependency. The racist ideologies of Maori stereotypes are usually just below the surface and Maoris are seen as dumb, lazy etc. *Puao Te Ata Tu*, however, clearly linked the current crisis of Maori people to historical causes. The alienation of Maori land they said is the 'taproot of our modern dependency'. This combined with state policies have been particularly destructive.

*As the deprivation of the Maori became unacceptably obvious, solutions were sought in the 'modernisation' of a 'backward' people in need of 'development'.*

(Puao-Te-Ata-Tu 1986:88)

The notion of dependency is also a psychological term that engenders the idea of an unhealthy relationship with a parent. Dependence was explored within the psychoanalytic tradition by Freud. Freud's theory viewed childhood as passing through several stages:

pre-natal to birth, infancy, childhood, pubescence, maturity, senescence and death. According to Freud, the lengthy duration of dependent infancy of humans, in comparison to the animal kingdom, helped to explain much about human development. There is a biological symbiosis between mother and child which continues for some time after birth but gradually the child becomes 'independent'. The child develops through stages of independence from nutrition, locomotion and later in orientation to the world. The parent-child relationship is considered crucial where the child gradually learns independent existence through parental guidance.

Psychoanalysts went further and hypothesised a link between social structure and personality development. Psychoanalytic theories were used to explain relationships between countries. Different forms of social organisation were supposed to require different degrees of 'maturity'. During the 1950s, authoritarian governments such as Japan were likened to children but the U.S was considered 'independent' (Franz A, Ross H 1952). Western ideologies of parenting were being projected on to the world.

In Aotearoa, the influence of Freud emerged in the Rakau Studies conducted by Jane and James Ritchie in the 1950s. These studies mixed psychological theory with ethnography. The studies were to look at Maori community life in a logging town, with special emphasis on family life and childrearing patterns.

These studies have been strongly criticised for they viewed Maori child rearing patterns as being the reason that Maori were not achieving in schools. Maori parenting patterns

were considered to create a rejection complex in the Maori child hence their difficulties in the school system. Albert Tahana (1978) says that the Ritchies work sanctioned the cultural deprivation views of the time and drew attention away from social structural inequalities. The Ritchies study, he says, were directly influential on the educational and psychological fields.

Many writers on Maori economic ills comment on Maori 'dependency'. When talking about iwi development, James Ritchie comments that:

*There is a general lack of resources to accomplish their objectives. Yet to ask for government support is to plunge further into the morass of dependency; it is the negation of sovereignty or mana motuhake.*

(Ritchie 1992:161)

What gets absolved in these statements is the role of the state in the creation of 'dependency' and the obligation by the state to redress the crisis. The current position of Maori is a 'created' dependency on the state. The state most definitely has a responsibility in addressing the current socio-economic positioning of Maori.

## Conclusion

Modernisation, development and dependency theory have all had the same emphases: they have focused and continue to focus on economic growth while overlooking social and political growth. They also focus on the ends/goals/purposes that are prescribed from the centre. Power is consequently maintained by a centre with indigenous groups positioned in the margins.

## (4.2) INDIGENOUS VIEWS OF DEVELOPMENT

The indigenous critique views development that emerged out of the colonial context with suspicion. Manuka Henare, in writing about development, says that when development involves a 'donor' and a 'recipient' then powerful tensions are built into the process. Power lies very much with the donor. Henare further points out that:

*Many tribal groups throughout the world have actually rejected the term development. Bitter experience has taught them that development means that the dominant group has some idea of what they want you to do. The process of transferring funds, resources or whatever is to get you to do what it is they believe is good for you.*

(Henare 1990:40)

In other words, somebody is clearly determining the nature, process and end result of 'development'.

The IWGIA<sup>1</sup> (Indigenous Working Group For Indigenous Affairs) outlined in its annual 1992 report the major problems facing indigenous peoples worldwide:

- *communal/collective orientation vs individual Western notion*
- *exploitation of natural resources*
- *insufficient political and economic power to maintain full control over lands and resources*
- *insufficient power to fight at international level*

---

<sup>1</sup>The Indigenous Work Group On Indigenous Affairs is based in Denmark. They are a non-indigenous group of anthropologists who play an advocacy role for indigenous peoples.

- *legal rights/interests and sovereignty affected by overseas deals*
- *poor economic and social conditions overall*

(IWGA Report 1992:175)

This list summarises some of the issues that have to be faced in the struggle towards iwi development. Dr Pare Hopa in her paper *Culture Development Interface* talks about two types of development, global top-down development and bottom up development. The latter type of development she likens to the Freirian concept:

*Specifically the development of individuals and communities involves their changing from seeing themselves as victims of circumstances to seeing themselves as being in control of their own worlds.*

(Hopa: 1989:46)

#### **(4.2.1) Tradition Vs Modernity**

Much of the discussion underlying development is underlain with the ideas of 'tradition' and 'modernity' and the tensions between these ideas. Colonisation and imperialism justified domination in the name of 'modernity', as has already been argued.

Pacific writers, in a collection of essays, have touched on some of these tensions in the book *Tu Galala: Social Change In The Pacific*. In viewing events in the Pacific, Rabuka's coup was often seen internationally as a return to 'tradition', whilst the 1987 Coalition victory in Fiji was an example of 'modernity'. These writers argue that modernity has been seen in the Pacific as the need to adopt Western democracy:

*Pacific nations are said to be returning to traditional ways ... the chaos of the jungle or a reaffirmation of mystical wisdom*

(Robie 1993:25)

Through the defining and redefining of what tradition is, there are consistent themes such as the view that government, freedom and human rights are foreign to non-Western societies, not part of their cultures and histories and therefore need to be taught. Colonialism was not democratic, it involved the suppression of the freedom of millions world-wide, and human-rights were ignored. Robertson (1993), and others, argue that the principles of human rights are universal property and that they are rooted in the experience of all peoples.

The struggles of 'independent' countries in the Pacific has been surrounded by a rhetoric of helplessness and the view that, left to their own devices, Pacific countries cannot cope. Rationales for not allowing autonomy and explanations for Third World problems have a familiar ring to them: that it is too soon for them to be granted independence, i.e they have not matured enough, there are cultural 'impediments' that hold up progress, there are incompatibilities of race, religion and/or culture within the country. But as pointed out:

*What appears as ethnic or cultural conflicts might be manifestations of deeper structural difficulties, including economic and social distortions created by colonialism and fostered since by both international and national interests.*

(Ibid:28)

Tradition, as these essays show, is problematic because tradition has been interpreted to benefit particular groups. There is concern for example over the lack of representation of



women in leadership roles. Jackie Leckie argues that the hegemony of elites has been further consolidated through controlling ideologies of 'tradition':

*Tradition has become part of the discourse of the elite but it is also accepted by the poor out of necessity. People denied real benefits of their labour require tradition to provide a degree of economic security. This reinforces elite domination while it simultaneously dampens subaltern consciousness and their potential to gain political power.*

(Leckie 1990:251)

Hau'ofa states that the consolidation of power elites has resulted in divisions between the poor and the elite:

*It is the privileged who can afford to tell the poor to preserve their traditions. But their perceptions of which traits of traditional culture to preserve are increasingly divergent from those of the poor, because in the end it is the poor who have to live out the traditional culture, the privileged can merely talk about it and they are in a position to be selective about what traits they can use, or more correctly, urge others to observe. And this is increasingly seen by the poor as part of the ploy by the privileged to serve greater advantages for themselves.*

(Ibid:10)

Although self-reliance has been the talk in the Pacific, development has meant an increasing social and economic integration within an Australasian dominated regional economy.

Freire has made some comments on development in his book *Pedagogy Of The Oppressed*. He makes the point that when cultural invasion has occurred the invader inevitably retains

control of decision making about the invaded - the invaded, however, may have the illusion of choice.

*For development to occur it is necessary: firstly that there be a movement of search and creativity having its seat of decision in the searcher; secondly that this movement occur not only in space, but in the existential time of the conscious searcher.*

(Freire 1972:129)

The distinction that Freire makes is between transformation and development that 'while all development is transformation, not all transformation is development' (Ibid). Survival alone is not development, for the oppressed exist as 'beings for another' on those who they are dependent upon, therefore they are unable to develop fully. The oppressed begin to develop when they begin to become 'beings for themselves'.

*In order to determine whether or not a society is developing, one must go beyond criteria based on indices of per capita income....The basic, elementary criterion is whether or not the society is a 'being for itself'. If it is not, the other criteria indicate modernisation not development.*

(Freire 1972:130)

In Freire's analysis, reform in this circumstance is about retaining hegemony. Reform is used for the purposes of controlling rebellion, rather than for aiding the group or society to become 'beings for themselves'.

#### **(4.3) IMPLICATIONS FOR IWI DEVELOPMENT**

Throughout the differing stories of 'development' constructed by the West, there has been

a similarity of theme. This is the view that culture (unless it was Western culture) is an impediment. These discourses are still widely expressed, as Haunani Kay Trask points out:

*Today, Marxists believe Hawaiian culture is an impediment to evolution and revolution; liberals believe it is an impediment to full civil rights; and white feminists believe it is an impediment to women's liberation. The similarities with missionaries are striking.*

(Trask 1993:274)

Development is clearly a problematic term for iwi. The adoption of the term development, whilst being strategic, may also mean that it can be co-opted by dominant groups to steer iwi development down a track so that iwi remain 'beings for another'. Development is not a politically neutral term and it may be difficult for us to control. The Western view of development is antithetical to the notion of tino rangatiratanga, for it views development as being determined by the West.

Iwi development and Maori development have been terms that were developed within government policy. These terms have been taken up by other Maori so it has now become a more general discourse.

Some of the critical questions that emerge for iwi from this chapter are: What is development? Who is controlling development? Is the proposed development necessary or is it something that we have been told is necessary? Is it the type of development that

---

involves a lot of work to bring rewards for only a few? If it is, will the benefits trickle down? Pacific writers tell us that this is unlikely. Are the types of development undertaken at the expense of cultural knowledge or through the commodification of that knowledge? If iwi are to retain the term development then there needs to be clarity of definition by iwi.